

REMARKS

The application has been amended to place it in condition for allowance at the time of the next Official Action.

Claim status

Claims 1-20 were previously pending in this application. New claims 21 and 22 are added. Therefore, claims 1-22 are presented for consideration.

Applicants note with appreciation the indication that claims 14 and 15 are allowable.

35 USC 102(a) rejection

Claims 1-10 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Morgan et al. U.S. 6,373,201. That rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to a secure electronic entity including means to store one or more objects.

The electronic entity might be a microcircuit card, for example, such as a bank card, an access control card, an identity card, a SIM card or a memory card, or a PCMCIA Card (see paragraph [0006] of the US publication - US-2006-0129849) and claims 18, 19 and 22.

One problem addressed by the present invention is to improve the security of an object stored in this kind of electronic entity "if it is possible to take account of the time

that has elapsed since a reference time related to that object, whether the object is the operating system of the card, a secret code (PIN, key, certificate), a data file, a file system, all application or access rights" (see paragraph [0007] of the US publication).

The prior art document to Morgan relates to a technical field which is distinct from that of the present invention, namely, the field of display systems, and more particularly to lamp timers used by projection display systems.

More specifically Morgan discloses (see Morgan, "Summary of the Invention") a display system comprising: - a lamp (104) for generating a beam of light, the lamp having a rated safe life value; - a memory device (EEPROM 102) associated with the lamp, in which a rated safe life value is stored: - a timer controller circuit (106), electronically connected to the memory 102, and capable of reading the rated safe life value from the memory and storing an elapsed lamp on time value in the memory. The timer controller circuit disables the lamp when:

- the elapsed lamp on time value exceeds the rated safe life value; or

- either the elapsed lamp on time value or the rated safe life value become irretrievably corrupted,

Thus, Morgan **does not** disclose a secure electronic entity including means to store one or more objects. Indeed, in Morgan the lamp which constitutes "the object" is not stored in

the memory device (EEPROM 102), as the memory device is contained in the lamp module (see Morgan column 3, lines 17-25).

Besides, the problem addressed by Morgan is to provide a reliable timer for arc lamps, which is difficult to defeat or reset (see Morgan, column 2, lines 19-20). Thus, the problem addressed by Morgan is totally different to that of the present invention, which is, in particular, to improve the security of an object stored in the electronic entity.

It is thus believed that Morgan neither discloses nor suggests the subject matter of present claim 1, and accordingly that the invention as presently claimed is not anticipated by Morgan.

35 USC 103(a) rejections

Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over MORGAN in view of PARATORE et al. U.S. 6,294,997. Claims 13, 16, 17 and 20 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over MORGAN in view of PARATORE and further in view of HENNIG U.S. 5,514,995 and claim 19 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over MORGAN in view of HENNIG. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Each of claims 11-13, 16, 17 19 and 20 depend from claim 1 and further define the invention. Neither PARATORE nor HENNIG disclose what is recited in claim 1. Thus, their combination with MORGAN would not render obvious the claims that

depend from claim 1. Thus, each of the claims pending in the application is believed to be patentable.

New claims 21 and 22 are added. Support for claim 21 can be found for example, in original claim 1 and at page 12 - lines 24-34 of the description (or at paragraph [0079] of the US publication). Indeed, as disclosed in the aforesaid passage of the description, if the lifespan has been reached or passed, the updating and invalidation means can act on the object stored in the secure electronic entity, in different ways, one of which being by updating the lifespan of the object, as presently claimed claim 22.

Support for claim 22 can be found, for example at page 1, line 31 of the description (at paragraph [0006] of the US Publication).

The new claims are believed to be patentable at least for the reasons set forth above. In addition, claim 22 more clearly distinguishes over Morgan, as the alternative feature according to which the updating and invalidation means render the object temporarily or permanently unusable when a result of said comparison is that the elapsed time has reached or passed the lifespan, is not recited in claim 22. Indeed, this feature may be considered as also applying to the object-lamp disclosed in Morgan.

Entry of the above amendments is earnestly solicited. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should there be any matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge the fee of \$104.00 for the two excess additional claims of any type, in which the fees are being paid online simultaneously herewith by credit card

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/Liam McDowell/

Liam McDowell, Reg. No. 44,231
209 Madison Street, Suite 500
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573

LM/jr